arXiv:1606.07723v1 [quant-ph] 24 Jun 2016

Logical synchronization: how evidence and hypotheses steer atomic clocks

John M. Myers[a] and F. Hadi Madjid[b]

[a]Harvard School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA;
[b]82 Powers Road, Concord, MA 01742, USA

ABSTRACT

A clock steps a computer through a cycle of phases. For the propagation of logical symbols from one computer to another, each computer must mesh its phases with arrivals of symbols from other computers. Even the best atomic clocks drift unforeseeably in frequency and phase; feedback steers them toward aiming points that depend on a chosen wave function and on hypotheses about signal propagation. A wave function, always under-determined by evidence, requires a guess. Guessed wave functions are coded into computers that steer atomic clocks in frequency and position—clocks that step computers through their phases of computations, as well as clocks, some on space vehicles, that supply evidence of the propagation of signals. Recognizing the dependence of the phasing of symbol arrivals on guesses about signal propagation elevates 'logical synchronization.' from its practice in computer engineering to a dicipline essential to physics. Within this discipline we begin to explore questions invisible under any concept of time that fails to acknowledge the unforeseeable. In particular, variation of spacetime curvature is shown to limit the bit rate of logical communication.

1. INTRODUCTION

As is well known, the atom or atoms in the atomic clock are passive—they do not "tick"—so the clock needs an active oscillator in addition to the atom(s). In designing an atomic clock to realize the second as a measurement unit in the International System of Units (SI) , one encounters two problems: (a) The resonance exhibited by the atom or atoms of the clock varies with the details of the clock's construction and the circumstances of its operation; in particular the resonance shifts depending on the intensity of the radiation of the atoms by the oscillator. (b) The oscillator, controlled by, in effect, a knob, drifts in relation to the knob setting. Problem (a) is dealt with by introducing a wave function parametrized by radiation intensity and whatever other factors one deems relevant. The SI second is then "defined" by the resonance that "would be found" at absolute zero temperature (implying zero radiation). For a clock using cesium 133 atoms, this imagined resonance is declared by the General Conference of Weights and Measures to be 9 192 631 770 Hz, so that the SI second is that number of cycles of the radiation at that imagined resonance.[1] To express the relation between a measured resonance and the

Further author information: (Send correspondence to J.M.M.)
J.M.M.: E-mail: myers@seas.harvard.edu, Telephone: 1 617 495 5263
F.H.M.: E-mail: gmadjid@aol.com, Telephone: 1 978 369 1808

imagined resonance at 0 K, a wave function is chosen. Problem (b) is dealt with by computer-mediated feedback that turns the knob of the oscillator in response to detections of scattering of the oscillator's radiation by the atom(s) of the clock, steering the oscillator toward an aiming point.

A key point for this paper is that the wave function incorporated into the operation of an atomic clock can never be unconditionally known. The language of quantum theory reflects within itself a distinction between 'explanation' and 'evidence'. For explanations it offers the linear algebra of wave functions and operators, while for evidence it offers probabilities on a set of outcomes. Outcomes are subject to quantum uncertainty, but uncertainty is only the tip of an iceberg: how can one "know" that a wave function describes an experimental situation? The distinction within quantum theory between linear operators and probabilities implies a gap between any explanation and the evidence explained.:[2–5]

PROPOSITION 1. *To choose a wave function to explain experimental evidence requires reaching beyond logic based on that evidence, and evidence acquired after the choice is made can call for a revision of the chosen wave function.* Because no wave function can be unconditionally known, not even probabilities of future evidence can be unconditionally foreseen. Here we show implications of the unknowability of wave functions for the second as a unit of measurement in the International System (SI), implications that carry over to both digital communications and to the use of a spacetime with a metric tensor in explaining clock readings at the transmission and reception of logical symbols.

Clocks that generate Universal Coordinated Time (UTC) are steered toward aiming points that depend not only on a chosen wave function but also on an hypothesized metric tensor field of a curved spacetime. Like the chosen wave function, the hypothesis of a metric tensor is constrained, but not determined, by measured data. Guesses enter the operations of clocks through the computational machinery that steers them. Taking incoming data, the machinery updates records that determine an aiming point, and so involves the writing and reading of records. The writing must take place at a phase of a cycle distinct from a phase of reading, with a separation between the writing and the reading needed to avoid a logical short circuit. In Sec. 2 we picture an explanation used in the operation of a clock as a string of characters written on a tape divided into squares, one symbol per square. The tape is part of a Turing machine modified to be stepped by a clock and to communicate with other such machines and with keyboards and displays. We call this modified Turing machine an *open machine*. The computations performed by an open machine are open to an inflow numbers and formulas incalculable prior to their entry. Because a computer cycles through distinct phases of memory use, the most direct propagation of symbols from one computer to another requires a symbol from one computer to arrive during a suitable phase of the receiving computer's cycle. In Sec. 3 we elevate this phase dependence to a principle that defines the *logical synchronization* necessary to a *channel* that connects clock readings at transmission of symbols to clock readings at their reception

Recognizing the dependence of logic-bearing channels on an interaction between evidence and hypotheses about signal propagation engenders several types of questions, leading to a *discipline of logical synchronization*, outlined in Sec. 4. The first type of question concerns patterns of channels that are possible aiming points, as determined in a blackboard calculation that assumes a theory of signal propagation. Sec. 5 addresses examples of constraints on patterns of channels under various hypotheses of spacetime curvature, leading to putting "phase stripes" in spacetime that constrain channels to or from a given open machine. An example of a freedom to guess an explanation within a constraint

of evidence is characterized by a subgroup of a group of clock adjustments, and a bound on bit rate is shown to be imposed by variability in spacetime curvature.

Sec. 6 briefly addresses the two other Types of questions, pertaining not to *hypothesizing* possible aiming points 'on the blackboard', but to *using* hypothesized aiming points, copied into feedback-mediating computers, for the steering of drifting clocks. After discussing steering toward aiming points copied from the blackboard, we note occasions that invite revision of a hypothesized metric tensor and of patterns of channels chosen as aiming points.

2. OPEN TURING MACHINE MODELS A COMPUTER IN A FEEDBACK LOOP

Computer-mediated feedback, especially as used in an atomic clock, requires logic open to an inflow of inputs beyond the reach of calculation. To model the logic of a computer that communicates with the other devices in a feedback loop, we modify a Turing machine to communicate with external devices, including other such machines. The Turing machine makes a record on a tape marked into squares, each square holding one character of an alphabet. Operating in a sequence of 'moments' interspersed by 'moves', at any moment the machine scans one square of the tape, from which it can read, or onto which it can write, a single character. A move as defined in the mathematics of Turing machines consists (only) of the logical relation between the machine at one moment and the machine at the next moment,[6] thus expressing the logic of a computation, detached from its speed; however, in a feedback loop, computational speed matters. Let the moves of the modified Turing machine be stepped by ticks of a clock. A step occurs once per a period of revolution of the clock hand. This period is adjustable, on the fly. We require that the cycle of the modified Turing machine correspond to a unit interval of the readings of its clock.

To express communication between open machines as models of computers, the modified Turing machine can receive externally supplied signals and can transmit signals, with both the reception and the transmission geared to the cycle of the machine. In addition, the modified Turing machine registers a count of moments at which signals are received and moments at which signals are transmitted. At a finer scale, *the machine records a phase quantity in the cycle of its clock, relative to the center of the moment at which a signal carrying a character arrives.* We call such a machine an *open machine*. An open machine can receive detections and can command action, for instance the action of increasing or decreasing the frequency of the variable oscillator of an atomic clock.

Calculations performed on an open machine communicating with detectors and actuators proceed by moves made according to a rule that can be modified from outside the machine in the course of operation. These calculations respond to received influences, such as occurrences of outcomes underivable from the contents of the machine memory, when the open machine writes commands on a tape read by an external actuator. The wider physical world shows up in an open machine as both (1) unforeseeable messages from external devices and (2) commands to external devices.

We picture a real-time computer in a feedback loop as writing records on the tape of an open machine. The segmentation into moments interspersed by moves is found not just in Turing machines but in any digital computer, which implies

PROPOSITION 2. *The logical result of any computation is oblivious to variations in speed at which the clock steps the computer.*

COROLLARY 2.1. *No computer can sense directly any variation in its clock frequency.*

Although it cannot directly sense variation in the tick rate of its clock, the logic of open machine stepped by an atomic clock can still control the adjustment of the clock's oscillator by responding to variations in the detection rate written moment by moment onto its Turing tape. A flow of unforeseeable detections feeds successive computations of results, each of which, promptly acted on, impacts probabilities of subsequent occurrences of outcomes, even though those subsequent outcomes remain unforeseeable. The computation that steers the oscillator depends not just on unforeseeable inputs, but also on a steering formula encoded in a program.

Remarks:

1. To appreciate feedback, take note that a formula is distinct from what it expresses. For example a formula written along a stretch of a Turing tape as a string of characters can contain a name ψ for wave function as a function of time variable t and space variables. The formula, containing ψ, once written, just "sits motionless," in contrast to the motion that the formula expresses.

2. Although unchanged over some cycles of a feedback loop, a feedback loop operates in a larger context, in which steering formulas are subject to evolution. Sooner or later, the string that defines the action of an algorithm, invoking a formula, is apt to be overwritten by a string of characters expressing a new formula. Occasions for rewriting steering formulas are routine in clock networks, including those employed in geodesy and astronomy.

3. COMMUNICATION CHANNELS AND LOGICAL SYNCHRONIZATION

Logical communication requires clocking. The reading of a clock of an open machine A—an A-reading—has the form $m.\phi_m$ where m indicates the count of cycles and ϕ_m is the phase within the cycle, with the convention that $-1/2 < \phi_m \leq 1/2$. We define a channel from A to B, denoted $\overrightarrow{AB}$, as a set of pairs, each pair of the form $(m.\phi_m, n.\phi_n)$. The first member $m.\phi_m$ is an A-reading at which machine A can transmit a signal and $n.\phi_n$ is a B-reading at which the clock of machine B can register the reception of the signal. Define a *repeating channel* to be a channel $\overrightarrow{AB}$ such that

$$(\forall \ell \in [\ell_1, \ell_2])(\exists m, n, j, k)(m + \ell j.\phi_{A,\ell}, n + \ell k.\phi_{B,\ell})] \in \overrightarrow{AB}, \tag{1}$$

For theoretical purposes, it is convenient to define an *endlessly repeating channel* for which ℓ ranges over all integers. Again for theoretical purposes, on occasion we consider channels for which the phases are all zero, in which case we may omit writing the phases.

Because they are defined by local clocks without reference to any metric tensor, channels invoke no assumption about a metric or even a spacetime manifold. For this reason evidence from the operation of channels is independent of any explanatory assumptions involving a manifold with metric and, in particular, is independent of any global time coordinate, or any "reference system".[7] Thus clock

readings at the transmission and the reception of signals can prompt revisions of hypotheses about a metric tensor field. A record format for such evidence was illustrated in earlier work,[8,9] along with the picturing of such records as *occurrence graphs*.

From the beating of a heart to the bucket brigade, life moves in phased rhythms. For a symbol carried by a signal from an open machine A to be written into the memory of an open machine B, the signal must be available at B within a phase of the cycle of B during which writing can take place, and the cycle must offer room for a distinct other phase. We elevate engineering commonplace to a principle pertaining to open machines as follows.

PROPOSITION 3. *A logical symbol can propagate from one open machine to another only if the symbol arrives within the writing phase of the receiving machine; in particular, respect for phasing requires that for some positive η any arrival phase ϕ_n satisfy the inequality*

$$|\phi_n| < (1 - \eta)/2. \tag{2}$$

Prop. 3 serves as a fixed point to hold onto while hypotheses about signal propagation in relation to channels are subject to revision. We call the phase constraint on a channel asserted by (2) *logical synchronization*. For simplicity and to allow comparing conditions for phasing with conditions for Einstein synchronization, we take the engineering liberty of allowing transmission to occur at the same phase as reception, so that both occur during a phase interval satisfying (2). The alternative of demanding reception near values of $\phi = 1/2$ can be carried out with little extra difficulty.

Remarks:

1. Note that ϕ_n in the proposition is a phase of a cycle of a variable-rate clock that is *not* assumed to be in any fixed relation to a proper clock as conceived in general relativity. Indeed, satisfying (2) usually requires the operation of clocks at variable rates.

2. The engineering of communications between computers commonly detaches the timing of a computer's receiver from that of the computer by buffering: after a reception, the receiver writes into a buffer that is later read by the computer.[10] In analyzing open machines we do without buffering, confining ourselves to character-by-character phase meshing as asserted in Prop. 3, which offers the most direct communication possible.

4. A DISCIPLINE OF LOGICAL SYNCHRONIZATION

Given the definition of a channel and the condition (2) essential to the communication of logical symbols, three types of questions arise:

Type I: What patterns of interrelated channels does one try for as aiming points?

Type II: How can the steering of open machines be arranged to approach given aiming points within acceptable phase tolerances?

Type III: How to respond to deviations from aiming points beyond tolerances?

Such questions point the way to exploring what might be called a *discipline of logical synchronization*. So far we notice two promising areas of application within this discipline:

1. Provide a theoretical basis for networks of logically synchronized repeating channels, highlighting

   (a) possibilities for channels with null receptive phases as a limiting case of desirable behavior, and

   (b) circumstances that force non-null phases.

2. Explore constraints on receptive phases imposed by gravitation, as a path to exploring and measuring gravitational curvature, including slower changes in curvature than those searched for by the Laser Gravitational Wave Observatory.[11]

4.1 Geometry of signal propagation

Answers to questions of the above Types require hypotheses, if only provisional, about signal propagation. For this section we assume that propagation is described by null geodesics in a Lorentzian 4-manifold M with one or another metric tensor field g, as in general relativity. Following Perlick[12] we represent an open machine as a timelike worldline, meaning a smooth embedding $\gamma\colon \zeta \mapsto \gamma(\zeta)$ from a real interval into M, such that the tangent vector $\dot\gamma(\zeta)$ is everywhere timelike with respect to g and future-pointing. We limit our attention to worldlines of open machines that allow for signal propagation between them to be expressed by null geodesics. To say this more carefully, we distinguish the *image* of a worldline as a submanifold of M from the worldline as a mapping. Consider an open region V of M containing a smaller open region U, with V containing the images of two open machines A and B, with the property that every point a of the image of A restricted to U is reached uniquely by one future-pointing null geodesic from the image of B in V and by one past-pointing null geodesic from the image of B in V. We then say A and B are *radar linkable* in U. We limit our attention to open machines that are radar linkable in some spacetime region U. In addition we assume that the channels preserve order (what is transmitted later arrives later). Indeed, we mostly deal with open machines in a gently curved spacetime region, adequately described by Fermi normal coordinates around a timelike geodesic.

For simplicity and to allow comparing conditions for phasing with conditions for Einstein synchronization, we take the liberty of allowing transmission to occur at the same phase as reception, so that both occur during a phase interval satisfying (2). The perhaps more realistic alternative of demanding reception near values of $\phi = 1/2$ can be carried out with little difficulty.

To develop the physics of channels, we need to introduce three concepts:

(1) We define a *group of clock adjustments* as transformations of the readings of the clock of an open machine. As it pertains to endlessly repeating channels, a group H of clock adjustments consists of functions on the real numbers having continuous, positive first derivatives. Group multiplication is the composition of such functions, which, being invertible, have inverses. To define the action of H on clock readings, we speak 'original clock readings' as distinct from 'adjusted readings' An adjustment $f_A \in H$ acts by changing every original reading ζ_A of a clock A to an adjusted reading $f_A(\zeta_A)$. As we shall see, clock adjustments can affect echo counts.

(2) To hypothesize a relation between the A-clock and an accompanying proper clock, one has to assume one or another metric tensor field g, relative to which to define proper time increments along

A's worldline; then one can posit an adjustment f_A such that $f_A(\zeta_A) = \tau_A$ where τ_A is the reading imagined for the accompanying proper clock when A reads ζ_A.

(3) We need to speak of positional relations between open machines. For this section we assume that when an open machine B receives a signal from any other machine A then B echoes back a signal to A right away, so the echo count Δ_{ABA} defined in Sec. 3 involves no delay at B. In this case, evidence in the form of an echo count becomes explained, under the assumption of a metric tensor field g, as being just twice the radar distance[12] from A to the event of reception by B.

5. TYPE-I QUESTIONS: MATHEMATICAL EXPRESSION OF POSSIBLE PATTERNS OF CHANNELS

Questions of Type I concern constraints on channels imposed by the physics of signal propagation. Here we specialize to constraints on channels imposed by spacetime metrics, constraints obtained from mathematical models that, while worked out so to speak on the blackboard, can be copied onto Turing tapes as aiming points toward which to steer the behavior of the clocks of open machines. Questions of Types II and III are deferred to the Sec. 6.

5.1 Channels with null phases as aiming points: two open machines linked by a two-way channel

We begin by considering just two machines. Assuming an hypothetical spacetime (M, g), suppose that machine A is given as a worldline parametrized by its clock readings: what are the possibilities and constraints for an additional machine B with two-way repeating channels $\overrightarrow{AB}$ and $\overrightarrow{BA}$ with a constant echo count? We assume the idealized case of channels with null phases, which implies integer echo counts. For each A-tick there is a future light cone and a past light cone. The future light cone from an A-reading $\zeta_A = m$ has an intersection with the past light cone for the returned echo received at $\zeta_A = m + \Delta_{ABA}$. Fig. 1 illustrates the toy case of a single space dimension in a flat spacetime by showing the two possibilities for a machine B linked to A by two-way channels at a given constant echo count. In each solution, the clocking of B is such that a tick of B occurs at each of a sequence of intersections of outgoing and incoming light cones from and to ticks of A. Note that the image of B, and not just its clock rate, depend on the clock rate of A.

Determination of the tick events for B leaves undetermined the B trajectory between ticks, so there is a freedom of choice. One can exercise this freedom by requiring the image of B to be consistent with additional channels of larger echo counts. A clock adjustment of A of the form $\zeta_A \to \zeta'_A = N\zeta_A$ for N a positive integer increases the density of the two-way channel by N and inserts $N - 1$ events between successive B-ticks, thus multiplying the echo count by N. As N increases without limit, B becomes fully specified.

Turning to two space dimensions, the image of B must lie in a tube around the image of A, as viewed in a three-dimensional space (vertical is time). So any timelike trajectory within the tube will do for the image of B. For a full spacetime of 3+1 dimensions, the solutions for the image of B fall in the corresponding "hypertube." The argument does not depend on flatness and so works for a generic, gently curved spacetime in which the channels have the property of order preservation.



Figure 1. (a) Worldline of A with tick events indicated; (b) Light cones associated to ticks of A; (c) Ticks of B_1 and B_2 at light cone intersections corresponding to $\Delta_{ABA} = \Delta_{BAB} = 3$.

A different situation for two machines arises in case only the image of A's worldline is specified while its clocking left to be determined. In this case the image of B can be freely chosen, after which the clocking of both A and B is constrained, as illustrated in Fig. 2 for the toy case of flat spacetime with 1 space dimension. To illustrate the constraint on clocking, we define a "lacing" of light signals to be a pattern of light signals echoing back and forth between two open machines as illustrated in Fig. 2 (b). For any event chosen in the image of A, there is a lacing that touches it. In addition to choosing this event, one can choose any positive integer N to be Δ_{ABA}, and choose $N-1$ events in the image of A located after the chosen event and before the next A-event touched by the lacing of light signals. The addition of lacings that touch each of the $N-1$ intermediating events corresponds to a repeating channel $\overrightarrow{AB}$ with echo count $\Delta_{ABA} = N$, along with a repeating channel $\overrightarrow{BA}$ with the same echo count $\Delta_{BAB} = N$. This construction does not depend on the dimension of the spacetime nor on its flatness, and so works also for a curved spacetime having the property of order preservation.

5.2 Example of free choice characterized by a transformation group

Evidence of channels as patterns of clock readings leaves open a choice of worldlines for its explanation. In the preceding example of laced channels between open machines A and B, part of this openness can be reflected within analysis by the invariance of the channels under a subgroup of the group of clock adjustments that "slides the lacings," as follows. Suppose that transmissions of an open machine A occur at given values of A-readings. We ask about clock adjustments that can change the events of a worldline that correspond to a given A-reading. If a clock adjustment f_A takes original A-readings ζ_A to a revised A-readings $f_A(\zeta_A)$, transmission events triggered by the original clock readings become triggered when the re-adjusted clock exhibits the *same readings*. As registered by



Figure 2. (a) Images of worldlines for open machines A and B freely chosen; (b) Light signals lacing A and B define tick events; (c) Interpolated lacings of light signals added to make $\Delta_{ABA} = \Delta_{BAB} = 3$.

original readings, the adjusted transmission occurs at $\zeta'_A = f_A^{-1}(\zeta_A)$. Based on this relation we inquire into the action of subgroups of $H \times H$ on the readings of the clocks of two open machines A and B. In particular, there is a subgroup $K(A, B) \subset H \times H$ that expresses possible revisions of explanations that leave invariant the repeating channels with constant echo count N. An element $f_A \times f_B \in K(A, B)$ is a pair of clock adjustments that leaves the channels invariant, and such a pair can be chosen within a certain freedom. For the adjustment f_A one is free to: (a) assign an arbitrary value to $f_A^{-1}(0)$; and (b), if $N > 1$, then for $j, k = 1, \ldots, N-1$, choose the value of $f_A^{-1}(j)$ at will, subject to the constraints that $k > j \Rightarrow f^{-1}(k) > f^{-1}(j)$ and $f^{-1}(N-1)$ is less than the original clock reading for the re-adjusted first echo from $f^{-1}(0)$. With these choices, f_B is then constrained so that each lacing maps to another lacing. The condition (a) slides a lacing along the pair of machines; the condition (b) nudges additional lacings that show up in the interval between a transmission and the receipt of its echo. In this way a freedom to guess within a constraint is expressed by $K(A, B$.

5.3 Channels among more than two open machines

Moving to more than two machines, we invoke the

> **Definition:** an *arrangement of open machines* consists of open machines with the specification of some or all of the channels from one to another, augmented by proper periods of the clock of at least one of the machines.

(Without specifying some proper periods, the scale of separations of one machine from another is open, allowing the arrangement to shrink without limit, thus obscuring the effect of spacetime curvature.)

Although gentle spacetime curvature has no effect on the possible channels linking two open machines, curvature does affect the possible channels and their echo counts in some arrangements of five or more machines, so that the possible arrangements are a measure spacetime curvature. The way



Figure 3. Plane figures, one of which maps to a sphere while preserving edge lengths

that spacetime curvature affects the possible arrangements of channels is analogous to the way surface curvature in Euclidean geometry affects the ratios of the lengths of the edges of embedded graphs. The effect on ratios shows up in mappings from graphs embedded in a plane to their images on a sphere. For example, a triangle can be mapped from a plane to a generic sphere, in such a way that each edge of the triangle is mapped to an arc of the same length along a great circle on the sphere. The same holds for two triangles that share an edge, as illustrated in Fig. 3, panel (a); however, the Gauss curvature of the sphere implies that the complete graph on 4 vertices generically embedded in the plane, shown in panel (b), cannot be mapped so as to preserve all edge lengths. The property that blocks the preservation of edge ratios is the presence of an edge in the plane figure that cannot be slightly changed without changing the length of at least one other edge; we speak of such an edge as "frozen."

In a static spacetime, which is all we have so far investigated, a generic arrangement of 4 open machines, is analogous to the triangle on the plane in that a map to any gently curved spacetime can preserve all the echo counts.

PROPOSITION 4. *Assume four open machines in a static spacetime, with one machine stepped with a proper-time period p_τ, and let N be any positive integer. Then, independent of any gentle Riemann*

curvature of the spacetime, the four open machines can be arranged, like vertices of a regular tetrahedron, to have six two-way channels with null phases, with all echo counts being $2N$. *Proof:* Assuming a static spacetime, choose a coordinate system with all the metric tensor components independent of the time coordinate, in such a way that it makes sense to speak of a time coordinate distinct from space coordinates (for example, in a suitable region of a Schwarzschild geometry). LetV_1 denote the machine with specified proper period p_τ, and let V_2, V_3, and V_4 denote the other three machines. For $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $i \neq j$, we prove the possibility, independent of curvature, of the channels

$$\overrightarrow{V_i V_j} = \{(k, k + N.0) | k \text{ any integer}\}. \tag{3}$$

Require that each of four machines be located at some fixed spatial coordinate. Because the spacetime is static, the coordinate time difference between a transmission at V_1 and a reception at any other vertex V_j (a) is independent of the value of the time coordinate at transmission and (b) is the same as the coordinate time difference between a transmission at V_j and a reception at V_1. For this reason any one-way repeating channel of the form (3) can be turned around to make a channel in the opposite direction, so that establishing a channel in one direction suffices. For transmissions from any vertex to any other vertex, the coordinate-time difference between events of transmission equals the coordinate time difference between receptions. A signal from a transmission event on V_1 propagates on an expanding light cone, while an echo propagates on a light cone contracting toward an event of reception on V_1. Under the constraint that the echo count is $2N$, (so the proper duration from the transmission event to the reception event for the echo is $2Np_\tau$), the echo event must be on a 2-dimensional submanifold—a sphere, defined by constant radar distance Np_τ of its points from V_1 with transmission at a particular (but arbitrary) tick of V_1. In coordinates adapted to a static spacetime, this sphere may appear as a "potatoid" in the space coordinates, with different points on the potatoid possibly varying in their time coordinate. The potatoid shape corresponding to an echo count of $2N$ remains constant under evolution of the time coordinate. Channels from V_1 to the other three vertices involve putting the three vertices on this potatoid. Put V_2 anywhere on the "potatoid". Put V_3 anywhere on the ring that is intersection of potatoid of echo count $2N$ radiated from V_2 and that radiated from V_1. Put V_4 on an intersection of the potatoids radiating from the other three vertices.
Q.E.D.

According to Prop 4 the channels, and in particular the echo counts possible for a complete graph of four open machines in flat spacetime are also possible for a spacetime of gentle static curvature, provided that three of the machines are allowed to set their periods not to a fixed proper duration but in such a way that all four machines have periods that are identical in coordinate time. The same holds if fewer channels among the four machines are specified.

But for five machines, the number of channels connecting them matters. Five open machines fixed to space coordinates in a static spacetime are analogous to the 4 vertices of a plane figure, in that an arrangement corresponding to an incomplete graph on five vertices can have echo counts independent of curvature, while a generic arrangement corresponding to a complete graph must have curvature-dependent relations among its echo counts.

PROPOSITION 5. *Assuming a static spacetime, consider an arrangement of five open machines obtained by starting with a tetrahedral arrangement of four open machines with all echo counts of* $2N$

as in Prop. 4, and then adding a fifth machine: independent of curvature, a fifth open machine can be located with two-way channels having echo counts of $2N$ linking it to any three of the four machines of tetrahedral arrangement, resulting in nine two-way channels altogether. Proof: The fifth machine can be located as was the machine V_4, but on the side opposite to the cluster V_1, V_2, V_3.
Q.E.D.



Figure 4. (a) 5 open machines with 9 two-way channels; (b) Five open machines with all 10 two-way channels

In contrast to the arrangement of 9 two-way channels, illustrated in Fig. 4 (a) consider an arrangement of 5 open machines corresponding to a complete graph on five vertices, with has ten two-way channels, as illustrated in Fig. 4 (b). For five open machines in a generic spacetime, not all of the ten two-way channels can have the same echo counts. Instead, channels in a flat spacetime as specified below can exist with about the simplest possible ratios of echo counts. Label five open machines, A_1, A_2, A_3, B_1, and B_2. Take B_1 to be stepped by a clock ticking at a fixed proper period p_τ, letting the other machines tick at variable rates to be determined. Let X be any machine other than B_1. For a flat spacetime it is consistent for the proper periods of all 5 machines to be p_τ, for the echo counts $\Delta_{B_1XB_1}$ to be $4N$ and for the echo counts $\Delta_{A_iA_jA_i}$ to be $6N$, leading to twenty channels, conveniently viewed as in Fig. 4 (b) as consisting of ten two-way channels.

PROPOSITION 6. *Consider 5 open machines each fixed to space coordinates in a static curved spacetime in which the machines are all pairwise radar linkable, with 10 two-way channels connecting each machine to all the others; then:*

1. *Allowing for the periods of the machines other than B_1 to vary, it is consistent with the curvature for all but one of the ten two-way channels to have null phases and echo counts as in a flat spacetime, but at least one two-way channel must have a different echo count that depends on the spacetime curvature.*

2. *Suppose m of the 10 two-way links are allowed to have non-zero phases. If the spacetime does not admit all phases to be null, in generic cases the least possible maximum amplitude of a phase decreases as m increases from 1 up to 10.*

3. *The periods of the clocks of the open machines can be taken to be the coordinate-time interval corresponding to the proper period p_τ at B_1.*

Proof: Reasoning as in the proof of Prop. 4 with its reference to a static spacetime shows that the same echo counts are possible as for flat spacetime *with the exception* that at least one of the two-way channels must be free to have a different echo count. For $m < 10$, similar reasoning shows that allowing $m+1$ machines vary in echo count allows reduction in the maximum variation from the echo counts in a flat spacetime, compared to the case in which only m machines are allowed to vary in echo count.
Q.E.D.

Adding the tenth two-way channel to an arrangement of five open machines effectively "freezes" all the echo counts. To define "freezing" as applied to echo counts, first take note an asymmetry in the dependence of echo counts on clock rates. Consider any two machines A and B; unlike echo count Δ_{BAB}, which B can change by changing it clock rate, the echo count Δ_{ABA} is insensitive to B's clock rate. An echo count Δ_{ABA} will be said to be *to* B and *from* A.

> **Definition:** An arrangement of open machines is *frozen* if it has an echo count to a machine B that cannot be changed slightly without changing the length of another echo count to B.

The property of being frozen is important because of the following.

PROPOSITION 7. *Whether or not a frozen arrangement of open machines is consistent with an hypothesized spacetime depends on the Weyl curvature of the spacetime.*

For example, think of the 5 open machines as carried by 5 space vehicles coasting along a radial geodesic in a Schwarzschild geometry. In this example the variation of echo counts with curvature is small enough to be expressed by non-null phases of reception. In Fermi normal coordinates centered midway between the radially moving open machine B_1 and B_2 one has the metric with a curvature parameter $\mu := GM/(c^2r^3)$, where r is the Schwarzschild radial coordinate to the origin of the Fermi normal coordinates, x is the radial distance coordinate from from the center point between B_1 and B_2, and y and z are transverse to the radial direction along which B_j coasts.[13] The speed of light is c. We make the adiabatic approximation which ignores the time dependence of r, so that in calculations to first order in curvature we take advantage of the (adiabatically) static spacetime by locating open machines at fixed values of x, y, z. The metric is symmetric under rotation about the (radially directed) x-axis. Let B_1 and B_2 be located symmetrically at positive and negative values, respectively, of the x-axis, and let A_0, A_1, and A_2 be located on a circle in the plane $x = 0$. With the five machines so located, the coordinate-time difference between transmissions is then the same as the coordinate-time difference between receptions, and the coordinate-time delay in one direction equals that in the opposite direction (as stated in the proof of Prop 4). We construct seven two-way channels as above with null phases and show that the remaining 3 two-way channels can have the equal phases, but that this phase must be non-null with a curvature dependent amplitude ϕ.

PROPOSITION 8. *Under the stated conditions, if $\mu p_\tau^2 c^2$ is small enough so that $27N\mu N^2 p_\tau^2 c^2/8 < 1/2$, then $\phi = -27GMN^3 p_\tau^2/(8r^3)$*

5.4 Changing curvature limits bit rate

For a fixed separation L between B_1 and B_2, an adiabatic change in curvature imposes a constraint on bit rate possible for the channels, stemming from a lower bound on clock periods. Suppose the cluster of 5 open machines is arranged so that the proper radar distance L from B_1 to B_2 is 6,000 km, suppose the cluster descends from a great distance down to a radius of $r = 30,000$ km from an Earth-sized mass $M_\oplus = 6.67 \times 10^{24}$ kg. For simplicity, assume that the positions and clock rates are continually adjusted to maintain null phases for all but the three channels $\overrightarrow{A_n A_{n\pm1}}$. Because $L \approx 2Np_\tau c$, Prop. 8 implies $\phi = -23ML^3/(48r^3c^3p_\tau)$, which with (2) implies that $p_\tau > 27GML^3/(32r^3c^3)$.

Substituting the parameter values, one finds that for the phases for the channels $\overrightarrow{A_n A_{n\pm1}}$ to satisfy (2), it is necessary that $p_\tau > 1.0 \cdot 10^{-13}$ s. If an alphabet conveys b bits/character, the maximum bit rate for all the channels in the 5-machine cluster is $b/p_\tau < 10^{13}b$ bits/s.

6. STEERING WHILE LISTENING TO THE UNFORESEEABLE

Turning from Type I to questions of Type II, we look at how the preceding "blackboard modeling" of clocks, expressed in the mathematical language of general relativity, get put to work when models are encoded into the open machines that manage their own logical synchronization. For questions of Type II (and Type III) both models that explain or predict evidence and the evidence itself, pertaining to physical clocks, come into play. Models encoded into computers contribute to the steering of physical clocks in rate and relative position toward an aiming point, generating echo counts as evidence that, one acquired, can stimulate the guessing of new models that come closer to the aiming point.

To express the effect of quantum uncertainty on logical synchronization, specifically on deviations from aiming points, one has to bring quantum uncertainty into cooperation with the representation of clocks by general-relativistic worldlines. This bringing together hinges on distinguishing evidence from its explanations. Timelike worldlines and null geodesics in explanations, being mathematical, can have no *mathematical* connection to physical atomic clocks and physical signals. To make such a connection them one has to invoke the logical freedom to make a guess. Within this freedom, one can resort to quantum theory to explain deviations of an atomic clock from an imagined proper clock, represented as a worldline, without logical conflict.

6.1 Need for prediction in steering toward an aiming point

Because of quantum uncertainty and for other reasons, if an aiming point in terms of channels and a given frequency scale is to be reached, steering is required, in which evidence of deviations from the aiming point combine with hypotheses concerning how to steer.[14,15] To keep things simple, consider a case of an aiming point with null phases, involving two open machines A and B, as in the example of Sec. 5, modeled by a given worldline A with given clock readings ζ_A, where B aims to maintain two-way, null-phase channel of given $\Delta_{ABA} = \Delta_{BAB}$. For this B registers arriving phases of reception and adjusts its clock rate and its position more or less continually to keep those phases small. Deviations in position that drive position corrections show up not directly at B but as phases registered by A, so the steering of machine B requires information about receptive phases measured by A. The knowledge of the deviation in position of B at ζ_B cannot arrive at B until its effect has shown up at A and been echoed

back as a report to B, entailing a delay of at least Δ_{BAB}, hence requiring that machine B predict the error that guides for Δ_{BAB} prior to receiving a report of the error. That is, steering deviations by one open machine are measured in part by their effect on receptive phases of other open machines, so that steering of one machine requires information about receptive phases measured by other machines, and the deviations from an aiming point must increase with increasing propagation delays that demand predicting further ahead.

As is clear from the cluster of five machines discussed in Sec. 5, the aiming-point phases cannot in general all be taken to be zero. For any particular aiming-point phase ϕ_0 there will be a deviation of a measured phase quantity ϕ given by

$$\delta := \phi - \phi_0 \tag{4}$$

Whatever the value of ϕ_0, adjustments to contain phases within tolerable bounds depends on phase changes happening only gradually, so that trends can be detected and responded to on the basis of adequate prediction (aka guesswork).

Remarks:

1. Unlike cycle counts of open machines, which we assume are free of uncertainty, measured phases and deviations of phases from aiming points are quantities subject to uncertainty. For logic to work in a network, transmission of logical symbols must preserve sharp distinctions among them; yet the maintenance of sharp distinctions among transmitted symbols requires responses to fuzzy measurements.

2. The acquisition of logical synchrony in digital communications involves an unforeseeable waiting time, like the time for a coin on edge to fall one way or the other.[10]

6.2 Adjusting the aiming point

Aiming points are not forever, and here we say a few words about questions of Type III, in which an aiming point based on a hypothesized metric tensor appears unreachable, and perhaps needs to be revised. We have so far looked at one or another manifold with metric (M, g) as some given hypothesis, whether explored on the blackboard or coded into an open machine to serve in maintaining its logical synchronization. In this context we think of (M, g) as "given." But deviations of phases outside of tolerances present another context, calling for revising a metric tensor field. In this context one recognizes that a metric tensor field is hypothesized provisionally, to be revised as prompted by deviations outside allowed tolerances in implementing an aiming point.

Drawing on measured phases as evidence in order to adjust a hypothesis of a metric tensor is one way to view the operation of the Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory (LIGO).[11] While LIGO sensitivity drops off severely below 45 Hz, the arrangement of five open machines of Prop. 6 has no low-frequency cutoff, and so has the potential to detect arbitrarily slow changes in curvature.

REFERENCES

1. B. N. Taylor and A. Thompson, Eds, *The International System of Units (SI)*, NIST Special Publication 330, 2008 Edition, National Institutes of Science and Technology.
2. J. M. Myers and F. H. Madjid, "A proof that measured data and equations of quantum mechanics can be linked only by guesswork," in S. J. Lomonaco Jr. and H.E. Brandt (Eds.) *Quantum Computation and Information*, Contemporary Mathematics Series, vol. 305, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2002, pp. 221–244.
3. F. H. Madjid and J. M. Myers, "Matched detectors as definers of force," Ann. Physics **319**, 251–273 (2005).
4. J. M. Myers and F. H. Madjid, "Ambiguity in quantum-theoretical descriptions of experiments," in K. Mahdavi and D. Koslover, eds., *Advances in Quantum Computation*, Contemporary Mathematics Series, vol. 482 (American Mathematical Society, Providence, I, 2009), pp. 107–123.
5. J. M. Myers and F. H. Madjid, "What probabilities tell about quantum systems, with application to entropy and entanglement," in A. Bokulich and G. Jaeger, eds., *Quantum Information and Entanglement*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK, pp. 127–150 (2010).
6. A. M. Turing, "On computable numbers with an application to the Entscheidungsproblem," Proc. London Math. Soc., Series 2, **42**, 230–265 (1936–37).
7. M. Soffel et al., "The IAU resolutions for astrometry, celestial mechanics, and metrology in the relativistic framework: explanatory supplement," The Astronomical Journal, **126**, 2687–2706 (2003).
8. J. M. Myers and F. H. Madjid, "Rhythms essential to logical communication," in Quantum Information and Computation IX, E. Donkor, A. R. Pirich, and H. E. Brandt, eds, Proceedings of the SPIE, **8057**, pp. 80570N1–12 (2011).
9. J. M. Myers and F. H. Madjid, "Rhythms of Memory and Bits on Edge: Symbol Recognition as a Physical Phenomenon," arXiv:1106.1639, 2011.
10. H. Meyr and G. Ascheid, *Synchronization in Digital Communications*, Wiley, New York, 1990.
11. The LIGO Scientific Collaboration (http://www.ligo.org) "LIGO: the Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory," Rep. Prog. Phys. **72**, 076901 (2009)
12. V. Perlick, "On the radar method in general-relativistic spacetimes," in H. Dittus, C. Lämmerzahl, and S. Turyshev, eds., *Lasers, Clocks and Drag-Free Control: Expolation of Relativistic Gravity in Space*, (Springer, Berlin, 2008); also arXiv:0708.0170v1.
13. F. K. Manasse and C. W. Misner, J. Math Phys., "Fermi normal coordinates and some basic concepts in differential geometry," **4**, 735–745 (1963).
14. T. E. Parker, S. R. Jefferts, and T. P. Heavner, "Medium-term frequency stability of hydrogen masers as measured by a cesium fountain," 2010 IEEE International Frequency Control Symposium (FCS), pp. 318–323 (2010). (available at http://tf.boulder.nist.gov/general/pdf/2467.pdf)
15. J. Levine and T. Parker, "The algorithm used to realize UTC(NIST)," 2002 IEEE International Frequency Control Symposium and PDA Exhibition, pp. 537–542 (2002).